

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2006

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Communication dated October 16, 2006.

By the above amendment, claims 6 and 15 are amended. Accordingly, claims 6, 10, 11, 15 and 16 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 and 12-14 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In order to clearly avoid requirement for restriction based on the claims being in combination/subcombination relationship, claims 6 and 15 have been amended.

As amended, claim 6 includes all the limitations of original claim 6. In particular, present claim 6 now requires "rinsing the object to be cleaned." To the extent there was a combination/subcombination relationship between original claim 6 and amended claim 6, there is no longer a restrictible relationship because all the limitations of original claim 6 are now present in amended claim 6.

Claim 15 has been amended to require that the inner wall is cleaned after the chemical liquid cleaning has been performed. This is a limitation that the Examiner indicated was not present in "combination" claim 15.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are no longer subject to restriction for the following reasons.

MPEP 806.05(c) instructs that a requirement for restriction between combination and subcombination inventions can be made only if the Examiner shows that a combination as claimed:

(A) does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability;

and (B) the subcombination can be shown to have utility by itself or in another materially different combination. When these factors cannot be shown such inventions are not distinct and restriction must not be made or maintained.

Further, upon entry of the amendments to claims 6 and 15, the claims are be categorized as set forth in MPEP 806.05(c)(I), i.e., AB_{sp}/B_{sp} . As explained in this section of the MPEP, where a combination as claimed sets forth the details of the subcombination as separately claimed, there is no evidence that combination AB_{sp} is patentable without the details of B_{sp} . In this situation, the inventions are distinct and a requirement for restriction must not be made or maintained, even if the subcombination has separately utility.

In view of the above, the Examiner is requested to conduct an examination of elected claims 6, 10, 11, 15 and 16. In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryosuke YONEKURA et al.

By: 

Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 9, 2006